

May 7, 1981

LB 541

the present time? My feeling is that we should compensate individuals through salary treatment so that these things are taken into consideration rather than adding these exceptions. I think it makes for poor state policy. Additionally, since Senator Maresh rose and indicated the number of individuals that they lose from the patrol each year and he indicated what the numbers are, as the presentation was made before the Appropriations Committee, if my memory serves me properly, I think the turnover within the state patrol is less than 5 percent, and if we are concerned about turnover, I think we should consider the turnover within state government which approximates 25 percent. So I don't think that 5 percent is a tremendous amount of turnover. Additionally, we were provided with figures on applicants who wished to become employed with the patrol and we know that of qualified individuals that make applications hundreds are turned away, so there are less positions available than those qualified individuals to fill them. I think it is a poor policy when we make exceptions. Again, I am supportive of the patrol, but I feel that these items should be included in their salaries and through that treatment they should receive the compensation rather than the exception that is being requested at present. Thank you.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, I also want to oppose the amendment. And I would just make one brief remark which, in part, reiterates what Senator Stoney has said. But this really reminds me of my old U.S. Army days. We had an onbase allowance and an offbase allowance, and an overseas allowance and a clothing allowance, and extra food allowance in some cases, and this kind of allowance and that kind of allowance, and when we got all done, nobody knew what anybody was making and nobody knew how to compare it with the other employees. Nobody knew how to compare it with private industry. It was just a big mess. And the federal government has been trying to patch up that mess for a long, long time. And what I am suggesting to you is, this clothing allowance thing, meal allowance thing, as Senator Stoney has indicated, that can spread out into all kinds of groups of public employees, and we can play that game in here for a long, long time, but it will just be disastrous. It will just make comparisons impossible. It will make the whole system of regulating and getting some equity between public employees much, much more difficult. It should be done as Senator Stoney indicated by adjustments to salary. Thank you.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Sieck.

4725